REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-26, and 29-37. By this Response, Applicants have added new claims 38-40 which are believe to be in condition for allowance. Support for the new claims can be found at pages 5 and 11 of the present specification. Upon entry of the new claims, claims 1-8, 11-26, and 29-40 will be pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-26, and 29-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Hickman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,130,888). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Legal Precedent

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Indeed, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The prior art reference must show the *identical* invention "*in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*" to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Hickman Does Not Disclose Identifying a Portion or Logical Block of the Screen.

Independent claims 11 and 20 recite, *inter alia*, "designating a *portion* of the screen at the controlled computer based upon the input event data and the program" (emphasis added). Independent claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, a system configured to "store *portions* of the interface screen identified by the controlled computer based upon input

events occurring at the controlling computer and based upon the program" (emphasis added). Independent claim 35 recites, *inter alia*, "identifying a *logical block* of the screen display affected by the input event at the controlled computer based upon the program and the input event data" (emphasis added). Conversely, Hickman is absolutely devoid of any teaching of designating a portion of the screen (or identifying a logical block of the screen), much less designating a portion or identifying a logical block of the screen based upon an input event.

The Examiner cited several passages of Hickman as disclosing these features. *See, e.g.*, Office Action, pages 2 (citing Hickman, col. 3, lines 39-43; col. 8, lines 16-28 and 57-60; col. 10, lines 44-59; col. 11, line 64 – col. 12, line 8). However, the first passage cited by the Examiner merely describes that a client computer can monitor the screen of a host computer and provide inputs to the host computer. Hickman, col. 3, lines 39-43. In the second cited passage, the reference states that a "snap shot" or dynamic reproduction of the host screen can be displayed at the client computer. Col. 8, lines 16-28. However, Hickman transmits the entire screen, and not just a portion or logical block of the display. Indeed, no mention is made by Hickman of reducing bandwidth demand, for example, by transmitting only a portion of the screen, and not the entire screen display generated by the application. In the third cited passage, Hickman simply states that screen updates may be sent with or without encryption. Col. 10, lines 44-59. Again, Hickman does not mention that only a portion or logical block of the screen is sent via the screen update. The last cited passage similarly describes that image information is sent from the host computer to the client computer for display at the client computer. Col. 11, line 64 – Col. 12, line 8. The reference indicates that all of the image information is sent. It does not state, expressly or implicitly, that only a portion or logical block of the image information is transmitted, as presently claimed. In sum, this cited portions of Hickman, as well as the entire Hickman reference, does *not* disclose <u>designating a portion</u> of the screen based upon an input event, or <u>identifying a logical block</u> of the screen based upon an input event. Accordingly, the

Hickman reference cannot anticipate independent claims 11, 20, 24, and 35, or their dependent claims.

Hickman Does Not Disclose Transmitting Data Representative of Logical Block.

Independent claims 11 and 20 recite, *inter alia*, "*transmitting* screen data representative of the *portion*" (emphasis added). Independent claim 35 recites, *inter alia*, "*transmitting* data representative of a *logical block* from the controlled computer to the controlling computer" (emphasis added). As discussed above, Hickman does not designate a portion of the screen or identify a logical block of the screen. Further, Hickman does not transmit data representative of such a portion or logical block. For this additional reason, Hickman cannot anticipate independent claims 11, 20, and 35, or their dependent claims. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-8, 11-26, and 29-37.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2007

Floron C. Faries
Reg. No. 59,991
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545